

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,080	01/07/2002	Robert Walter Berry JR.	AUS920010801US1	6558
7590	07/13/2004			EXAMINER TRIMMINGS, JOHN P
Gregory W. Carr Carr & Storm, L.L.P. 670 Founders Square 900 Jackson Street Dallas, TX 75202			ART UNIT 2133	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/042,080	BERRY ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	John P Trimmings	2133

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2002.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.  
    4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6)  Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.  
7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 07 January 2002 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/2002

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date.       .  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other:       .

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-11 are presented for examination.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The examiner has acknowledged the applicant's Information Disclosure of 1/7/2002.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claim 10 recites the limitation "the combinatorial logic" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Savir, U.S.; Patent No. 5642362, and in view of "Scan Latch Design for Delay Test", Jacob Savir, 1997 Test Conference (IEEE Proceedings International), Nov 1-6 1997, pp 446-453.

As per Claim 1:

Savir (5642362) teaches a logic circuit (column 9 line 3) comprising: a combinatorial logic (FIG.4 22) having at least first and second input signal lines (column 9 line 4) and at least a first output signal line (column 9 lines 4-5); and first (FIG.3 1), second (FIG.3 2), and third (FIG.3 18) shift register latches (SRLs) connected to the combinatorial logic (see FIG.3), the third SRL being connected to the first output signal line (FIG.3 OUT) for receiving a first output signal of the combinatorial logic. But Savir (5642362) fails to further teach the exact circuit connections as claimed by the applicant. But in an analogous art, Savir (IEEE Proceedings) does teach the first SRL being connected to the first input signal line for outputting a first scan signal thereto (see page 451 2<sup>nd</sup> column operation "3."), the second SRL being connected to the second input signal line for outputting a second scan signal thereto (see page 451 2<sup>nd</sup> column operation "3."); and a logic unit having at least first and second logic input lines (FIG.7b

Scan Out with Feedback line) and a logic output line (FIG.7b Scan In), the first logic input line being connected to the first SRL for receiving the first scan signal therefrom (page 450 column 2 last paragraph), the second logic input line being connected to a pattern adjust line for receiving a control signal (FIG.7b Feedback line), the logic output line being connected to the second SRL for outputting a logic output signal thereto (page 450 column 2 last paragraph), wherein the logic output signal is at least one of the first scan signal and an inverted signal of the first scan signal, depending on the logic value of the control signal (see logic in FIG.7b, which is an XOR inverting array). And Savir (IEEE) on pages 452 and 453 states the advantage as enabling faster AC testing in a distributed manner and not requiring special positioning of logic and latches. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated as suggested by Savir (IEEE) would find it obvious to combine the XOR circuit at the scan out and scan in of Savir (IEEE) with the AC test circuit of Savir (5642362), thus providing a better AC test circuit as described.

As per Claim 2:

Savir (IEEE) further teaches the logic circuit of claim 1, wherein the logic unit comprises an XOR gate having the first and second logic input lines and the logic output line (see logic in FIG.7b, which is an XOR inverting array). And in view of the motivation previously mentioned, the claim is rejected.

As per Claim 3:

Savir (IEEE) further teaches the logic circuit of claim 1, wherein the logic output signal is the first scan signal when the control signal is a logical 0, and is the inverted

signal when the control signal is a logical 1 (see logic in FIG. 7b, which is an XOR inverting array). And in view of the motivation previously mentioned, the claim is rejected.

As per Claim 4:

Savir (IEEE) further teaches the logic circuit of claim 1, wherein each of the SRLs comprises a master latch and a slave latch, the slave latch being connected to the master latch for receiving a master output signal therefrom, the master latch having a data input signal line, a scan input signal line, a data clock line, and a scan clock line, the slave latch having a slave clock line (see example Icon 3 SRL in FIG. 9). And in view of the motivation previously mentioned, the claim is rejected.

As per Claim 5:

Savir (IEEE) further teaches the logic circuit of claim 1, wherein each of the first, second, and third SRLs comprises a master latch and a slave latch, the slave latch being connected to the master latch for receiving a master output signal therefrom, the master latch having a data input signal line, a scan input signal line, a data clock line, and a scan clock line, the slave latch having a slave clock line, wherein the master latch is synchronized to a data clock signal on the data clock line for receiving and temporarily storing a logic data bit through the data input signal line, wherein the master latch is synchronized to a scan clock signal on the scan clock line for receiving and temporarily storing a scan data bit through the scan input signal line, and wherein the slave latch is synchronized to a slave clock signal on the slave clock line for receiving and temporarily storing at least one of the logic data bit and the scan data bit from the

master latch (see example Icon 3 SRL in FIG. 9). And in view of the motivation previously mentioned, the claim is rejected.

As per Claims 6, 10 and 11:

Savir (5642362) teaches a method and means for enhancing test coverage in a level-sensitive scan design (LSSD) (column 11 line 34), the method comprising the steps of: receiving a first scan data bit by a first SRL (FIG.3 16); temporarily storing the first scan data bit in the first SRL (FIG.3 1 after 1<sup>st</sup> clock); transmitting the first scan data bit from the first SRL to a second SRL (FIG.3 after 2<sup>nd</sup> clock); temporarily storing the first scan data bit in the second SRL (FIG.3). However, Savir (5642362) is not specific in teaching the balance of the applicant's claim. But in the analogous art of Savir (IEEE), the following is taught; transmitting an inverted bit of the first scan data bit from the first SRL to the second SRL (Page 451 step 1); temporarily storing the inverted bit in the second SRL (Page 451 step 2); receiving a second scan data bit by the first SRL (Page 451 step 1); temporarily storing the second scan data bit in the first SRL (Page 451 step 2); transmitting the first scan data bit from the second SRL to a combinatorial logic, and the second scan data bit from the first SRL to the combinatorial logic (Page 451 step 3); transmitting the inverted bit from the second SRL to the combinatorial logic, and the second scan data bit from the first SRL to the combinatorial logic (Page 451 step 4); receiving a first output data bit of the combinatorial logic by a third SRL, the first output data bit being output from the combinatorial logic receiving at least the first and second scan data bits; temporarily storing the first output data bit in the third SRL (Page 451 step 5); receiving a second output data bit of the combinatorial logic by a third SRL, the

second output data bit being output from the combinatorial logic receiving at least the inverted bit and the second scan data bit; temporarily storing the second output data bit in the third SRL (Page 451 step 6); and enhancing test coverage of the combinatorial logic by obtaining both the first and second output data bits from the third SRL (Page 451 last 3 paragraphs). And in view of the motivation previously mentioned, the claims are rejected.

As per Claim 7:

Savir (IEEE) further teaches the method of claim 6, wherein the step of transmitting an inverted bit of the first scan data bit from the first SRL to a second SRL further comprises the step of inputting a logical 1 to a first input of an XOR gate (FIG.7b Feedback lines), wherein a second input of the XOR gate is connected to the first SRL for receiving the first scan data bit therefrom (FIG.7b Scan Out), and wherein an output of the XOR gate is connected to a scan input of the second SRL (FIG.7b Scan In). And in view of the motivation previously mentioned, the claim is rejected.

As per Claim 8:

Savir (IEEE) further teaches the method of claim 6, wherein each of the first, second, and third SRLs comprises a master latch and a slave latch, the slave latch being connected to the master latch for receiving a master output signal therefrom, the master latch having a data input signal line, a scan input signal line, a data clock line, and a scan clock line, the slave latch having a slave clock line (see example Icon 3 SRL in FIG. 9). And in view of the motivation previously mentioned, the claim is rejected.

As per Claim 9:

Savir (IEEE) further teaches the method of claim 6, wherein each of the first, second, and third SRLs comprises a master latch and a slave latch, the slave latch being connected to the master latch for receiving a master output signal therefrom, the master latch having a data input signal line, a scan input signal line, a data clock line, and a scan clock line, the slave latch having a slave clock line, wherein the master latch is synchronized to a data clock signal on the data clock line for receiving and temporarily storing a logic data bit through the data input signal line, wherein the master latch is synchronized to a scan clock signal on the scan clock line for receiving and temporarily storing a scan data bit through the scan input signal line, and wherein the slave latch is synchronized to a slave clock signal on the slave clock line for receiving and temporarily storing at least one of the logic data bit and the scan data bit from the master latch (see example Icon 3 SRL in FIG. 9). And in view of the motivation previously mentioned, the claim is rejected.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John P Trimmings whose telephone number is 703-305-0714. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 7:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on 703-305-9595. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



John P Trimmings  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2133

jpt



Guy J. Lamarre  
for

Albert DeCady  
Primary Examiner